

## REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-13, 15, 17, 20-23, 25, 28-30, 32, and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated Kirani et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0032027A1, hereinafter Kirani '027). In response, Applicants amended claims 14-15, 23, and 30 to clarify that at least one of text data, audio data, and incoming melody data is added according to the presence of processing and the type of processing designated by the request, the incoming melody data giving notification, by music of incoming data when the data is received, and respectfully traverse the rejection based on these amendments. Applicants also traverse the rejection as it applies to independent claims 17, 25, and 32 based on the features added to these amended claims.

Kirani '027 is directed to a media spooler system that provides a methodology for efficient transmission of media content from client devices. However, Kirani '027 fails to disclose or suggest adding, with respect to data received via a communication unit, at least one of text data, audio data, and incoming melody data according to the presence of processing and the type of processes designated by a request, and storing the data process by a data addition unit.

In contrast, amended claims 14-15, 23 and 30 now call for the above-described feature. In particular, claims 14 and 15 are amended to include the phrase “according to the presence of processing and the type of processing designated by the request.” Support for this feature can be found in Applicant’s Specification on page 26, lines 4-9. Similarly, claims 23 and 30 include the feature of “adding, with respect to the data received by the request, at least one of text data, audio data and incoming melody data according to the presence of processing and the type of processing designated by the request, the incoming melody data giving notification, by music, of incoming data when the data is received.”

With respect to claims 17, 25 and 32, these claims now include additional features such as a display unit displaying a content of an output region, and converting internal data to a predetermined format and outputting the converted internal data to an output region. Applicants respectfully submit that Kirani '027 fails to disclose or suggest the features now recited in amended claims 17, 25 and 32. For these reasons, withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection based on Kirani '027 is respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 9, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirani '027. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 14 for the reasons recited above with respect to the §102(e) rejection.


Kirani '027 fails to disclose or suggest the feature of adding at least one of text data, audio data, and incoming melody data. In particular, Kirani fails to teach this feature based on the presence of processing and the type of processing designated by a request, and storing the data processed by a data addition unit, as now recited in amended claim 14. For this reason, withdrawal of the §103(a) of rejection of claim 14 is respectfully requested.

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirani '027 in view of Kirani et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0016818A1, hereinafter Kirani '818). Since this claim is cancelled, the rejection is now moot.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,  
GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

**Customer No. 24978**  
February 5, 2008  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: (312) 360-0080  
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315  
P:\DOCS\1117\72839\CI8063.DOC

By:   
Joseph P. Fox  
Registration No. 41,760